

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are pending. Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,044,373 to Gladney et al. (hereinafter “Gladney”).

The Gladney reference is directed to a system and method for controlling a client’s access to a protected element, wherein the protected element is contained in a protected resource which includes a data manager. In Gladney, the protecting resource and the protected resource are arranged in a distributed configuration. In the authorization process of Gladney, authorization is enforced at an application level with the data manager making calls to the protecting resource manager.

In Applicants’ invention, the enforcement mechanism, including the enforcing construct, is localized in the system that requires an authorization mechanism. Independent claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 16, 24, 27, 30, and 31 have been amended to recite that “an instruction to enforce said object-oriented enforcement construct is embedded in compiled source code and said source code is stored in a computer-readable medium.” Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is not taught by Gladney, nor any other art of record. Applicants further submit that Gladney fails to provide a teaching of an object-oriented enforcement construct associated with the invocation of a method, as recited in the aforementioned independent claims.

With regard to the rejection of claims 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, these claims have been amended to specify that the compiled source code is stored in a computer readable medium. It is, therefore, submitted that claims 9 and 12, as amended, provide statutorily allowable subject matter.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 9, 12, 15, 16, 24, 27, 30, and 31 are allowable over the art of record. Furthermore, the pending dependent claims are allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claims.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

FILED ELECTRONICALLY  
July 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

*/Gary W. Hamilton/*

Gary W. Hamilton  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,834